REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 8-13, and 18-23 were pending in the application and all were rejected. Claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 12, 20, 21, 22 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found in Applicant's disclosure as published in United States Publication 2002/0049722, specifically at paragraphs [0020], [0021], and [0023]. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 112

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 11, 21, and 28 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action stated that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification. Certain claim elements were specified:

"wherein said request comprises: an indicator of a requested language; a message to be converted into said requested language, wherein said message is provided in a language other than the requested language; and display attributes for formatting a display of the requested message on the display device." Support for these claim elements can be found in the following paragraphs:

[0020]: "In the above described manner, a user of companion device 100 can work in a language that is not initially supported by companion device 100"

[0021] "PC 200 next performs the task of referencing an appropriate language database containing the requested language element for the determined, desired language (step

320).”

[0027]: “It should be appreciated by those skilled in the art that the language element conversion process performed by PC 200 may include information specifying the font type, size and characteristics that are needed for properly spaced, sized and shaped characters to display on the companion device 100.”

“wherein individual ones of a plurality of said databases are each associated with a different one of said languages” Support for this claim element can be found in FIG. 3 which shows different user language databases.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 8, 10-13, 18, 20-23 and 28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmor (US 6601108) in view of Sekiguchi (US 6185604).

Claim 1, as amended, is not unpatentable over Marmor in view of Sekiguchi. Marmor’s Automatic Conversion System uses a completely different topology and paradigm than what is recited in claim 1. The Office Action sees Marmor’s “client” and “server” as analogous to the instant “host” and “companion.” If that were true, then Marmor would not need a converter because Marmor’s “server” would provide the requested language element without need for an intermediate converter, just as the instant “host” is able to do. In actuality, Marmor teaches away from the claimed subject matter wherein the “host” is able to provide the requested language element, including converting it to a bitmap image. This is not the case in Marmor. See Marmor, claims 1 and 11; and Figs. 1A and 1B.

Also, see Marmor at Col. 4, lines 35 – 41: "An automatic converter, in accordance with preferred embodiment of the invention is integrated into a client-server relationship as a (hidden) proxy. When the client downloads information from the server, the converter converts the information to a standard usable by the client. When the client enters input data to the server, the converter converts the input data to a standard usable by the server." Col. 5, lines 8-11: "In a preferred embodiment of the invention, data from the server which cannot normally be displayed on the client is converted, **by the automatic converter**, into image files for display on the client." [emphasis added]

Further, Marmor does not teach or suggest a "digitizer input system." Marmor's input message is restricted to a web document. See Marmor at Col. 8, lines 7-8: "a converter which receives an Internet hypertext document from the server."

Page 4 of the Office Action states: "Marmor fails to specifically disclose wherein said companion computing device, without conversion from character codes to graphic elements, presents the bitmap representation as a full screen image of the requested message on said display device." This admitted deficiency in Marmor is not addressed by Sekiguchi. Sekiguchi's email/fax machine performs format conversion between email and fax, therefore Sekiguchi's bitmap representation, by necessity, is displayed in the same language as originally provided in the email or fax; it is not displayed in a language that is not supported by the receiving machine. Further, Sekiguchi's transmission follows a path from a first machine, such as a PC, to a converter, then to a fax machine. Unlike the present invention, Sekiguchi's converted message is not returned to the initial machine.

It would not have been obvious to combine Marmor with Sekiguchi because Sekiguchi relies on an "email/facscimile machine" which of necessity must store data in both formats. See Sekiguchi at Col. 4, lines 10-12: "A storage memory 10-5 stored e-mail data and also coded data used in facsimile communication." This teaches away from the instant invention which purposefully keeps storage and processing requirements on the companion device to a minimum. Further, the host computer's storage requirements are also kept to a minimum because the language elements are all stored in databases.

Further, in order for Sekiguchi to present his bitmap representation, Sekiguchi requires multiple transmission links, including a link to the public switched telephone network (Col. 15, lines 45-50) and three different components: 1) the computer sending the email; 2) the email/fax machine; and 3) the fax machine. See Sekiguchi, col. 6, lines 44-62:

> The flow of information from the personal computer 1-5 to a Fukuoka sales office is described below.
>
> An e-mail to a Fukuoka sales office, produced by the personal computer 1-5, is transferred to the e-mail server 1-10 as follows. The e-mail is transferred, according to the e-mail transfer protocol SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol recommended by IETF), via the remote router 1-4 and further via the private line 1-6, to the post office "fff" 12-2 provided in the storage device of the e-mail server 1-10 at the Fukuoka branch office wherein the post office "fff" 12-2 is used to distribute e-mails to sales offices in Fukuoka city. After that, the e-mail/facsimile machine 1-11 gets the e-mail from the above post office as indicated by an arrow 1-15. The e-mail/facsimile machine 1-11 converts the e-mail data to image data. The e-mail/facsimile machine 1-11 then makes a call to the facsimile destination "093-222-333" and sends the resultant image data to a facsimile machine 1-13 as indicated by an arrow 1-16. The facsimile transmission is performed in accordance with the facsimile communication protocol T.30 recommended by ITU-T.

Claims 2, 8, 10, and 28 are not unpatentable over Marmor and Sekiguchi because they are dependent on claim 1, and claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Marmor in view of Sekiguchi. Further, the Office Action found that claim 8 is not taught by Marmor. Further, it is not addressed by Sekiguchi.

Claims 11 and 21 are method and storage medium counterparts to claim 1 and have been amended with similar claim limitations; therefore they are allowable for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 12, 13, and 18 are dependent on claim 11; therefore they are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 11 is allowable.

Claims 22 and 23 are dependent on claim 21; therefore they are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is allowable.

The Office Action rejected claims 9 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmor in view of Sekiguchi, and further in view of Official Notice.

Claims 9 and 19 are dependent on claims 1 and 11, respectively, and as such, are patentable for at least the same reasons (as discussed above) that claims 1 and 11 are patentable. Further, claims 9 and 19 contain a limitation that is not taught by either Marmor or Sekiguchi. Neither cited reference teaches nor suggests using a digitizer input device such as a stylus. The Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to combine a tool such as a stylus with the teachings of Marmor and Sekiguchi, but Applicant disagrees. Marmor is restricted to HTTP documents and applets and Sekiguchi is restricted to emails and fax transmissions. Since neither reference discusses any kind of user input that can be entered with a stylus, it would not have

been obvious to combine the cited references with known stylus input.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending

claims.

Respectfully submitted,

_/Michael J. Buchenhorner/_____

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

Date: November 11, 2008

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.
8540 S.W. 83 Street
Miami, Florida 33143
(305) 273-8007 (voice)
(305) 595-9579 (fax)